the courage of his convictions. He personified the notion of being able to disagree—even vehemently—without being disagreeable.

In fact, I cannot help but recall that when Senators were offering their appreciation to Senator HELMS upon the occasion of his retirement, Senator Wellstone offered very heartfelt and touching words. He acknowledged that he and Senator HELMS often differed on the issues. But Paul respected the purity of the convictions of his colleague across the aisle—and he wished him well.

Now, it is Paul Wellstone who has left our midst, and the entire Senate family shares in the sense of loss. We have a desk that was once filled with Paul's irrepressible spirit, and it strikes me that Paul Wellstone perished in pursuit of the very ideal he held to be so noble and worthy—public service.

This institution is always at its strongest when it is populated with men and women of Paul Wellstone's authenticity. We are diminished by his passing, and he will be missed.

CONFIRMATION OF JOHN ROGERS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week the Senate voted to confirm the nomination of John Rogers who is nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. By confirming this nomination, we are trying to move forward in providing help to the Sixth Circuit. Earlier this year, we held a hearing for Judge Julia Gibbons to a seat on the Sixth Circuit, who was confirmed by the Senate on July 29, 2002 by a vote of 95 to 0. With last night's vote, the Democratic-led Senate confirmed the 15th judge to our federal Courts of Appeal and our 98th judicial nominee since the change in Senate majority in July 2001. I have placed a separate statement in the RECORD on the occasion of confirming that many of this President's judicial nominees in just 16 months.

Republicans often say that almost half of the seats on the Sixth Circuit are vacant but what they fail to acknowledge is that most of those vacancies arose during the Clinton administration and before the change in majority last summer. None, zero, not one of the Clinton nominees to those current vacancies on the Sixth Circuit received a hearing by the Judiciary Committee under Republican leadership. With the confirmation of Professor Rogers, we have reduced the number of vacancies on that court to six, but four of those remaining lack home-State consent due to the President's failure to address the legitimate concerns of Senators in that circuit whose nominees were blocked by Republicans during the period of Republican control of the Senate.

The Sixth Circuit vacancies are a prime and unfortunate legacy of the past partisan obstructionist practices under Republican leadership. Vacancies on the Sixth Circuit were perpetuated during the last several years of the Clinton administration when the Republican majority refused to hold hearings on the nominations of Judge Helene White, Kathleen McCree Lewis and Professor Kent Markus to vacancies in the Sixth Circuit.

One of those seats has been vacant since 1995, the first term of President Clinton. Judge Helene White of the Michigan Court of Appeals was nominated in January 1997 and did not receive a hearing on her nomination during the more than 1,500 days before her nomination was withdrawn by President Bush in March of last year. Judge White's nomination may have set an unfortunate record.

Her nomination was pending without a hearing for over four years—51 months. She was first nominated in January 1997 and renominated and renominated through March of last year when President Bush chose to withdraw her nomination. Under Republican control, the Committee averaged hearings on only about eight Courts of Appeals nominees a year and, in 2000, held only five hearings on Courts of Appeals nominees all year.

In contrast, Professor Rogers was the fifteenth Court of Appeals nominee of President Bush to receive a hearing by the Committee in less than a year since the reorganization of the Senate Judiciary Committee. In 16 months we held hearings on 20 circuit court nominations. Professor Rogers was being treated much better than Kathleen McCree Lewis, a distinguished African American lawyer from a prestigious Michigan law firm. She never had a hearing on her 1999 nomination to the Sixth Circuit during the years it was pending before it was withdrawn by President Bush in March 2001.

Professor Kent Markus, another outstanding nominee to a vacancy on the Sixth Circuit that arose in 1999, never received a hearing on his nomination before his nomination was returned to President Clinton without action in December 2000. While Professor Markus' nomination was pending, his confirmation was supported by individuals of every political stripe, including 14 past presidents of the Ohio State Bar Association and more than 80 Ohio law school deans and professors.

Others who supported Professor Markus include prominent Ohio Republicans, including Ohio Supreme Court Chief Justice Thomas Moyer, Ohio Supreme Court Justice Evelyn Stratton, Congresswoman DEBORAH PRYCE, and Congressman DAVID HOBSON, the National District Attorneys Association, and virtually every major newspaper in the state.

In his testimony to the Senate in May, Professor Markus summarized his experience as a Federal judicial nominee, demonstrating how the ''history regarding the current vacancy backlog is being obscured by some.'' Here are some of things he said:

On February 9, 2000, I was the President's first judicial nominee in that calendar year. And then the waiting began. . . .

At the time my nomination was pending, despite lower vacancy rates than the 6th Circuit, in calendar year 2000, the Senate confirmed circuit nominees to the 3rd, 9th and Federal Circuits. . . . No 6th circuit nominee had been afforded a hearing in the prior two years. Of the nominees awaiting a Judiciary Committee hearing, there was no circuit with more nominees than the 6th Circuit.

With high vacancies already impacting the 6th Circuit's performance, and more vacancies on the way, why, then, did my nomination expire without even a hearing? To their credit, Senator DEWINE and his staff and Senator HATCH's staff and others close to him were straight with me.

Over and over again they told me two things: 1. There will be no more confirmations to the 6th Circuit during the Clinton administration[.] 2. This has nothing to do with you; don't take it personally—it doesn't matter who the nominee is, what credentials they may have or what support they may have—see item number 1. . . .

The fact was, a decision had been made to hold the vacancies and see who won the presidential election. With a Bush win, all those seats could go to Bush rather than Clinton nominees.

As Professor Markus identified, some on the other side of the aisle held these seats open for years for another President to fill, instead of proceeding fairly on the consensus nominees pending before the Senate. Some were unwilling to move forward, knowing that retirements and attrition would create four additional seats that would arise naturally for the next President. That is why there are now so many vacancies on the Sixth Circuit.

Had Republicans not blocked President Clinton's nominees to this court, if the three Democratic nominees had been confirmed and President Bush appointed the judges to the other vacancies on the Sixth Circuit, that court would be almost evenly balanced between judges appointed by Republicans and Democrats. That is what Republican obstruction was designed to avoid, balance. The same is true of a number of other circuits, with Republicans benefitting from their obstructionist practices of the preceding six and a half years. This combined with President Bush's refusal to consult with Democratic Senators about these matters is particularly troubling.

Long before some of the recent voices of concern were raised about the vacancies on that court, Democratic Senators in 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000 implored the Republican majority to give the Sixth Circuit nominees hearings. Those requests, made not just for the sake of the nominees but for the sake of the public's business before the court, were ignored. Numerous articles and editorials urged the Republican leadership to act on those nominations.

Fourteen former presidents of the Michigan State Bar pleaded for hearings on those nominations. The former Chief Judge of the Sixth Circuit, Judge Gilbert Merritt, wrote to the Judiciary Committee Chairman years ago to ask that the nominees get hearings and

that the vacancies be filled. The Chief Judge noted that, with four vacancies, the four vacancies that arose in the Clinton Administration, the Sixth Circuit ''is hurting badly and will not be able to keep up with its work load due to the fact that the Senate Judiciary Committee has acted on none of the nominations to our Court.'' He predicted: ''By the time the next President in inaugurated, there will be six vacancies on the Court of Appeals. Almost half of the Court will be vacant and will remain so for most of 2001 due to the exigencies of the nomination process. Although the President has nominated candidates, the Senate has refused to take a vote on any of them.''

However, no Sixth Circuit hearings were held in the last three full years of the Clinton Administration (almost his entire second presidential term), despite these pleas. Not one. Since the shift in majority last summer, the situation has been exacerbated further as two additional vacancies have arisen.

The Committee's April 25th hearing on the nomination of Judge Gibbons to the Sixth Circuit was the first hearing on a Sixth Circuit nomination in almost five years, even though three outstanding, fair-minded individuals were nominated to the Sixth Circuit by President Clinton and pending before the Committee for anywhere from one year to over four years. Judge Gibbons was confirmed by the Senate on July 29, 2002, by a vote of 95 to 0. We did not stop there, but proceeded to hold a hearing on a second Sixth Circuit nominee, Professor Rogers, just a few short months later in June.

Just as we held the first hearing on a Sixth Circuit nominee in many years, the hearing we held on the nomination of Judge Edith Clement to the Fifth Circuit last year was the first on a Fifth Circuit nominee in seven years and she was the first new appellate judge confirmed to that Court in six years.

When we held a hearing on the nomination of Judge Harris Hartz to the Tenth Circuit last year, it was the first hearing on a Tenth Circuit nominee in six years and he was the first new appellate judge confirmed to that Court in six years. When we held the hearing on the nomination of Judge Roger Gregory to the Fourth Circuit last year, it was the first hearing on a Fourth Circuit nominee in three years and he was the first appellate judge confirmed to that court in three years.

A number of vacancies continue to exist on many Courts of Appeals, in large measure because the recent Republican majority was not willing to hold hearings or vote on half—56 percent—of President Clinton's Courts of Appeals nominees in 1999 and 2000 and was not willing to confirm a single judge to the Courts of Appeals during the entire 1996 session.

From the time the Republicans took over the Senate in 1995 until the reorganization of the Committee last July, circuit vacancies increased from 16 to 33, more than doubling. Democrats have broken with that recent history of inaction. In the last 16 months, we have held 26 judicial nominations hearing, including 20 hearings for circuit court nominees.

Professor Roger's nomination was also the fourth judicial nomination from Kentucky to be considered by the Committee in its first year, and the eighth nomination from Kentucky overall. There are no judicial vacancies left in the State.

Professor Rogers of the University of Kentucky College of Law has experience as an appellate litigator and a teacher, and is a prolific author on a number of difficult legal topics. It is important to note that aspects of his record raise concerns. As a professor, he has been a strong proponent of judicial activism. No Clinton judicial nominee with such published views would ever have been confirmed during the period of Republican control. In his writings, Professor Rogers has called on lower court judges to reverse higher court precedents, if the lower court judge thinks the higher court will ultimate reverse its own precedent. Such an activist approach is inappropriate in the lower Federal courts. The Supreme Court itself has noted that lower courts should follow Supreme Court precedent and not anticipate future decisions in which the Supreme Court may exercise its prerogative to overrule itself.

Prognostications about how the Supreme Court will rule often turns out to be wrong. For example, some predicted that the Supreme Court would overturned Miranda, but the Supreme Court, in an opinion by Chief Justice Rehnquist, declined to do so. Similarly, people like Professor Rogers have called on the Supreme Court to overturn Roe v. Wade, but thus far the Supreme Court has rejected calls to reverse itself in this important decision regarding the rights of women and has resisted calls to return this country to the awful period of dangerous back alley abortions.

Professor Rogers also suggested in his academic writings that lower court judges should consider the political views of Justices in making the determination of when lower courts should overrule Supreme Court precedent. In his answers to the Committee, Professor Rogers acknowledged that he had taken that position but he now says that lower courts should not look to the views of Justices expressed in speeches or settings other than their opinions. Also, in his answers to the Committee, Professor Rogers said he would give great weight to Supreme Court dicta, or arguments that are not part of the holding of the case. I would like to take this opportunity to urge him to take seriously the obligation of a judge to follow precedent and the holdings of the Supreme Court, rather than to look to dicta for views that may support his own personal views. I would also urge him resist acting on his academic notion that a judge should diverge from precedent when he anticipates that the Supreme Court may eventually do so.

Professor Rogers has assured us that he would follow precedent and not overrule higher courts, despite his clear advocacy of that position in his writings as a scholar. He has sworn under oath that he would not follow the approach that he long advocated. As with President Bush's Eighth Circuit nominee Lavenski Smith, who was confirmed earlier this summer, I am hopeful that Professor Rogers will be a person of his word: that he will follow the law and not seek out opportunities to overturn precedent or decide cases in accord with his private beliefs rather than his obligations as a judge.

I would also note that during his tenure at the Justice Department, Professor Rogers appeared to support an expansive view of the power of the Executive Branch vis-a-vis Congress. I am hopeful, however, that Professor Rogers will recognize the important difference between being a zealous advocate for such positions and being a fair and impartial judge sworn to follow precedents and the law.

When he was asked to describe any work he had handled which was not popular but was nevertheless important, he said that the case which came to mind was one in which he defended the CIA against a lawsuit seeking damages for the CIA's illegal opening of the private mail of tens of thousands of U.S. citizens during this 1970s or 1980s. Those were dark days of overreaching by the intelligence community against the rights of ordinary law-abiding American citizens. Although times have changed forever since the tragic events of September 11, I think it is important that the American people have access to judges who will uphold the Constitution against government excesses while also giving acts of Congress the presumption of constitutionality to which our laws are entitled by precedent.

Professor Rogers has repeatedly assured the Committee, however, that he would follow precedent and not seek to overturn decisions affecting the privacy of women or any other decision of the Supreme Court. Senator MCCONNELL has also personally assured me that Professor Rogers will not be an activist but is sincerely committed to following precedent if he is confirmed. I sincerely hope that his decisions on the Sixth Circuit do not prove us wrong.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.